REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I.   STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 32, 35 and 41-48 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 32, 35 and 41, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for these amendments is provided at [0070] of the specification. Claims 5, 9-31, 33, 34, 36-40, 42 and 43 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of any subject matter. No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II.   REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 32, 35, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,917,472 to Perala (hereinafter, merely "Perala") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,842 to Kirk, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Kirk") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,548,304 to Yoshino (hereinafter, merely "Yoshino").

III.   RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"A display control apparatus...

each cursor has a predetermined priority value which can be varied at a subsequent use;

wherein said selection of content information is determined by a decision weighted with said priority value of said cursors; and

<u>wherein said priority value of said cursors varies as a function of said   selection of content information</u>." (Emphasis added)

An example of varying the priority value of a cursor as a function of the selection of content information is assigning a cursor the highest priority value if that cursor's designation of content information does not result in a selection of that content information by the selecting means. As a more specific example, assume that there are three users, User 1, User 2, and User 3, each having a unique cursor. Initially, the priority value of each cursor is the same. User 1 and User 2 both designate a first hyperlink and User 3 designates a second hyperlink. The selecting means selects the first hyperlink. Because User 3's designation was not selected, User 3 is then assigned a higher priority. Of course, these are just examples and should not be considered the only interpretation of this claim language.

As understood by Applicants, Perala relates to a system that is usable by at least two persons (owner and customer) in connection with an application which does not support multiple mice or multiple cursor presentations. Each person has a respective mouse and the customer is permitted to participate in the operation of the application, at least to the extent of being able to point to objects on the screen by means of a cursor.

As understood by Applicants, Kirk relates to a system and method for providing shared access to a three-dimensional virtual environment synchronously with hypertext browsing. A cospace server receives a request from a client, tracks the requests, and stores components of the requested files. When a certain threshold of users has requested a file, the cospace server constructs a three-dimensional room description and sends it to the clients that are browsing the file.

As understood by Applicants, Yoshino relates to a system and method for resolving conflicting requests for cursor control during display.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Perala, Kirk, or Yoshino taken either alone or in combination that would teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1.

Specifically there is no teaching or suggestion of a display control apparatus wherein <u>each cursor has a predetermined priority value which can be varied</u> at a subsequent use, said <u>selection of content information is determined by a decision weighted with said priority value of said cursors and wherein said priority value of said cursors varies as a function of said selection of content information</u>, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 32, 35 and 41 are also believed to be patentable.

IV.   DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent on an independent claim discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each

dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the

individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with

respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the

Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis

for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any

overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the

claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to

issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By _____
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800